

# In the United States Court of Federal Claims

## OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 19-1069V

UNPUBLISHED

LISA KAISER,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND  
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: November 19, 2021

Special Processing Unit (SPU);  
Ruling on Entitlement; Concession;  
Table Injury; Influenza (Flu) Vaccine;  
Shoulder Injury Related to Vaccine  
Administration (SIRVA)

*Paul R. Brazil, Muller Brazil, LLP, Dresher, PA, for Petitioner.*

*Ryan Daniel Pyles, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.*

### **RULING ON ENTITLEMENT**<sup>1</sup>

On July 24, 2019, Lisa Kaiser filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*<sup>2</sup> (the “Vaccine Act”). Petitioner alleges that she suffered a Table injury – Shoulder Injury Related to Vaccine Administration (“SIRVA”) – as a result of her November 3, 2016 influenza (“flu”) vaccination. Petition at 1. Petitioner further alleges that the vaccine was administered within the United States, that she suffered the residual effects of her injury for more than six months, and that there has been no prior award or settlement of a civil action on her behalf as a result of her injury. See Petition at 1, ¶¶ 2, 20-21. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

---

<sup>1</sup> Because this unpublished Ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I am required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2012) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). **This means the Ruling will be available to anyone with access to the internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), Petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within this definition, I will redact such material from public access.

<sup>2</sup> National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all section references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

On November 17, 2021, Respondent filed his Rule 4(c) Report and Proffer of Compensation in which he concedes that Petitioner is entitled to compensation in this case. Respondent's Rule 4(c) Report and Proffer of Compensation at 1. Specifically, Respondent indicates that

[m]edical personnel at the Division of Injury Compensation Programs, Department of Health and Human Services (DICP), have reviewed the facts of this case and concluded that [P]etitioner's claim meets the Table criteria for SIRVA. Specifically, [P]etitioner had no history of pain, inflammation or dysfunction of the affected shoulder prior to intramuscular vaccine administration that would explain the alleged signs, symptoms, examination findings, and/or diagnostic studies occurring after vaccine injection; she more likely than not suffered the onset of pain within forty-eight hours of vaccine administration; her pain and reduced range of motion were limited to the shoulder in which the intramuscular vaccine was administered; and there is no other condition or abnormality present that would explain petitioner's symptoms. 42 C.F.R. § 100.3(a), (c)(10). Therefore, [P]etitioner is entitled to a presumption of vaccine causation.

*Id.* at 7-8. Respondent further agrees that

[w]ith respect to other statutory and jurisdictional issues, the records show that the case was timely filed, that the vaccine was received in the United States, and that petitioner satisfies the statutory severity requirement by suffering the residual effects or complications of her injury for more than six months after vaccine administration. See 42 U.S.C. §§ 300aa-11(c)(1)(D)(i). Petitioner also avers that she has "never received an award or settlement for [her] vaccine injuries, nor [has she] filed a civil action." Ex. 1 at 1. Thus, in light of the information contained in [P]etitioner's medical records and affidavit, [R]espondent concedes that entitlement to compensation is appropriate under the terms of the Vaccine Act.

*Id.* at 8.

**In view of Respondent's position and the evidence of record, I find that Petitioner is entitled to compensation.**

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**s/Brian H. Corcoran**

Brian H. Corcoran  
Chief Special Master